

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

PIN	3850	COUNTY	San Bernardino
APPLICANT	Running Springs Water District	AMOUNT REQUESTED	\$237,968
PROJECT TITLE	Hilltop Water Management Project	TOTAL PROJECT COST	\$317,291

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed regional plan is for water use efficiency by means of water conservation, recycling of the areas wastewater and in concert with this proposed plan to use the water also for fire mitigation purposes and vegetation/forestry irrigation. Our goal is no net water loss from the mountain communities. We propose to support conservation and efficient use of water and to minimize the need for new water sources. We propose to use reclaimed water from mountain sewage to augment local water supplies when such reclamation is consistent with public health and environmental standards. Along with the protection and replenishment of the limited local water supplies, this plan offers recreation activities by the proposed lake in a community park acting as a water storage intermediary in our plan.

WORK PLAN - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has a detailed and specific work plan that adequately documents the proposal. Weighting factor is 3.

Score: 6

Comment: This proposal is not for an IRWMP. The proposal appears to be for engineering analysis and design of water recycling and wastewater projects. The proposal and the recycled water use listed has merit, however, the plan requires additional work before doing the preliminary and final design proposed. There is a work plan, budget and schedule with tasks which correlate together. There are brief descriptions for the water recycling projects. More detail is needed. The proposal also needs to address progress reports and support any cost estimates with documentation.

DESCRIPTION OF REGION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific description that adequately documents the region. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 2

Comment: The region is somewhat defined. Topographic maps are provided but are too small and difficult to read. An overall map showing agency and district boundaries is not provided. The documentation fails to show or describe existing major water related infrastructure or the locations of all the proposed implementation projects. The applicant does not discuss the quality and quantity of water resources in the area.

OBJECTIVES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific planning objectives. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 6

Comment: The regional planning objectives are explained. The applicant states that the objectives are determined by brainstorming with local leaders, citizens, district board members, and engineers. The proposed plan does not include statewide priorities and it could better address major water related objectives and conflicts and provide a process to reduce conflicts between users, agencies, regulatory bodies, etc. One of the planning objectives is water use efficiency, however, it doesn't include water conservation.

INTEGRATION OF WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented how water management strategies will be integrated. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 4

Comment: The proposal includes multiple water management strategies and shows an understanding of how the strategies work together to produce synergy. However, it does not describe the technical process used for determining the water management strategies being considered nor did it document how integrated water management strategies would occur. Not all of the IRWM strategies are considered. The plan is basically a water recycling plan.

IMPLEMENTATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately detailed plan implementation. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 6

Comment: The proposal does not include a schedule past adoption. It does not discuss the development of an institutional structure to ensure project implementation. The applicant does state that monitoring the plan's performance will be through written reports to their Board and through regional meetings. The end products proposed can not be implemented without additional analysis, assurances, approvals, and stakeholder involvement.

IMPACTS AND BENEFITS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately presented and documented the impacts and benefits of the Plan. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 6

Comment: The impacts and benefits are partially addressed. The proposal discusses some potential benefits of the projects and mentions that CEQA will be addressed via a subcontract. More detailed analysis of the impacts and benefits is needed.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

DATA AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data and technical analysis components of the proposal. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 3

Comment: The proposal refers to specific data to support planning to date, but needs funding to complete advanced technical analysis. The available data is limited but appears to be reasonable to support the efforts. The applicant has a good understanding of their particular needs.

DATA MANAGEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data management procedures. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 2

Comment: The proposal does not include strong processes or procedures for gathering and managing data specific to the implementation of the planned projects. The applicant states that they support statewide data needs but does not demonstrate how the data will do this.

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented stakeholder involvement concerns. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 3

Comment: Stakeholder involvement is partially addressed through consensus meetings. The proposal doesn't identify a clear process for stakeholder involvement in project development and implementation of the projects, including how they may influence decisions. Environmental justice concerns are not covered and it is unclear if all appropriate stakeholders are included. The proposal does not state what, if any, analysis, consensus, assessment, and assurances have occurred or are in place regarding the concepts and stakeholders.

DISADVANTAGE COMMUNITIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented disadvantaged community concerns. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 1

Comment: There is no discussion of DACs benefiting from the proposal. However, it is mentioned that the small region has some population that are below the poverty line. The applicant fails to directly address the criteria.

RELATION TO LOCAL PLANNING - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented the Plan's relationship to local planning efforts. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 2

Comment: The applicant partially documents the relationship of the proposal to the 10-year county plan. It is not clear if this is the only planning document available or how the local agency planning documents will relate to the IRWM water management strategies and the dynamics between the two levels of planning documents.

AGENCY COORDINATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented agency coordination issues. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 2

Comment: The proposal describes local agency coordination but the applicant has not adequately documented other agency coordination issues. The proposal does not adequately describe coordination and cooperation with relevant State and federal agencies in IRWMP components.

TOTAL SCORE: 43